

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application; Claims 1-5 and 7-11 having been amended, and new Claims 14-20 having been added, by way of the present response. Applicants respectfully assert that support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and that therefore no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action Claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onodera in view of Schwopfinger, and Claims 3, 4, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onodera in view of Schwopfinger, and further in view of Kon. Applicants respectfully assert that the above amendments to the claims have overcome the rejections for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to stencil printers (e.g., as recited in independent Claims 1 and 8). Independent Claims 1 and 8 recite a print drum including a porous hollow cylinder rotatably supported and configured such that a perforated stencil is wrapped around an outer periphery of the print drum. Pressing means are used for forming a pressing portion when pressed against the print drum. Feeding means are used for feeding a sheet-like recording medium toward the pressing portion. Independent Claim 1 further recites a plurality of conveying members configured to convey the recording medium. One of the conveying members expected to contact, when the recording medium carrying an image on one surface thereof is reversed and again fed by the feeding means, the one surface first is provided with a highly oil-repellent surface. The one of the conveying members includes a cam member and a registration roller pair having a first roller disposed on a lever and a second roller provided with the highly oil-repellent surface, the cam member configured to

contact an end of the lever to move the first roller into and out of contact with the second roller. Independent Claim 8 recites a registration roller pair configured to convey the recording medium toward the pressing portion at preselected timing. One roller of the registration roller pair expected to contact, when the recording medium carrying an image on one surface thereof is reversed and again fed by the feeding means, the one surface first is provided with a highly oil-repellent surface. A cam member is configured to contact an end of a lever on which a second roller of the registration roller pair is disposed to move the second roller into and out of contact with the one roller.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, Onodera is directed to a sheet feeding device for a printer. As shown in Figure 10, for example, of Onodera, an un-shown moving mechanism moves a registration roller 33a into and out of contact with a registration roller 33b.¹

Applicants respectfully assert that Onodera does not teach or suggest, however, the claimed features of a cam member configured to contact an end of the lever to move a first roller into and out of contact with a second roller, as recited in independent Claim 1. Rather, as discussed above, Onodera does not discuss relevant details of the moving mechanism that moves the registration roller 33a into and out of contact with the registration roller 33b.

The Office Action relies on Schwopfinger in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies of Onodera. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that Schwopfinger does not remedy these deficiencies. Specifically Applicants respectfully assert that Schwopfinger, which the Office Action relies on to teach features of a roller, does not show or state rollers moving into or out of contact with one another, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Thus, for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Onodera nor Schwopfinger, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the claimed

¹ From Column 13, line 62 to Column 14, lines 3.

features recited in independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 8 is allowable for reasons similar to independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claim 8.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-7 and 9-19 are allowable for the same reasons as independent Claims 1 and 8 from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of dependent Claims 2-7 and 9-19.

Applicants respectfully assert that new independent Claim 20 is allowable for reasons similar to those of independent Claim 1, as discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of independent Claim 20.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/765,137
Reply to Office Action of December 7, 2004

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340

GJM/PH/me

I:\ATTY\PH\24S\248135\PRP AM 02.02.05.DOC